

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."

[PAYABLE WITHIN FOUR MONTHS]

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.
BY ORSON S. MURRAY.

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1842.

VOL. XIV. NO. 17.



POETRY.

SABBATH MORN.

Softly the mellow light beamed
Joyous the first dawning gleamed;
Brightly the silver rays streamed,
To usher this glorious day.
Cherubic millions are singing,
Singing their tribute are bringing,
While joining to praise and to pray.
Join ye, in spirit, the chorus;
Sabbath and joy are before us,
Jesus on high shall restore us
To mansions of peace and of bliss.
Death shall then shorten no pleasure;
We shall not purchase our treasure;
Mind we'll not measure measure,
While sorrow we ever dismiss.

THE PIOUS MINSTREL'S DYING HOUR.

With feeble touch he swept those chords,
Which oft had woke to thrilling words,
Strung by his skillful hand,
The sound at first rose soft and low.
'Twas plaintive music, sweet and slow,
As heard from spirit-land.

But as his soul, with native power,
Grew rapt in that inspiring hour,
And fired this earthly clod;
He struck with magic force each string,
And called each living voice to sing
The matchless life of God.

His sunken eye with radiance beamed,
His pallid face all burning gleamed,
His voice grew firm and high,
He woke the pride of that song,
Which aunts immortal will prolong,
In realms above the sky.

He ceased. The kindling spirit's fled;
That form which numbered with the dead;
But where has flown the soul?
Hark on that holy song to heaven,
Your guilt and sorrow ever given,
Where endless ages roll.

He lives in everlasting bliss,
And sings where countless pleasures is.
Before God's burning throne;
It sings of pardon, peace and God
Redemption at the price of blood
And grace to rebels shown.

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

BRANDON, SATURDAY JAN. 8, 1842.

The article below is given to the people, from their own numbers. The majority of those who assume to be guides and teachers—who "love to be called men, Rabbi, Rabbi"—are far wanting in their duty, in teaching so much of the great fundamental parts of practical Christianity as is unpopular with a wicked and perverse generation, the people are finding it necessary to take into their own hands the work of self and mutual instruction. This it is their right, their privilege, and their duty to do. Brother Everett need make no apology for appearing before the public. The common sense and Christian faithfulness of the common people is worth infinitely more to a depraved world than all the learning and jesuitism of the schools. It is not necessary for me to stop here and protest that "I am a touch a lover of science, literature and religion, as any body." My sentiments in regard to these things are known. But those who have taken the keeping of the minds and morals of community into their charge, and into whose hands these precious interests have been implicitly committed, need looking to. The object of these remarks is, not to throw suspicion upon every thing, and everybody, to upon any thing or anybody, without consideration; but to awaken attention which will lead to examination and purification. There has been too much of taking things upon trust—of believing whatever we have been taught to believe, and doing what we have been told to do, without knowing why and wherefore it has been believed and done. An admirable and very successful way of getting along with the world has been to cry out against innovations, false prophecies, ultras, &c. &c. But whoever is acquainted with the history of the world, and has taken observation, knows that those who have always raised these cries, have followed up, step by step, and have seized upon and taken into their own care, just as fast as the odium has passed off, the very things which they just before derided and anathematized. In the mean time, their language against those who have made the innovations and paved the way for them has been, "wretches," "crucify them." And the influence of those who have done these things and used this language has been too effectual in creating and putting out of existence the most devoted and self-sacrificing benefactors of mankind in all ages of the world. But it is not all ways to be so. As the people grow wiser they will examine and investigate for themselves. And as they more and more learn to discern between truth and error, they will less and less suffer themselves to be the tools of envy and malice in the hands of the aristocracy. It is cause for rejoicing, in behalf of truth and the great interests of mankind, that the working people are learning to think, examine, investigate, and speak out for themselves. This is not satisfactory for effect, but for themselves. It is only pointing out lawfully to the multitude their true interest, against the destructive influences of illegitimate power. The time is not far distant when such men as C. R. Watkins, and their kindred more prudent conductors in opposition to unpopular truth, will be seen as they

are. The people are everywhere taking the work into their own hands. Let aristocrats and monopolists, in church and state, tremble.

NON-RESISTANCE.

NEW HAVEN, Jan. 3, 1842.

Dear brother Murray:—I enclose to you a short opener to the subject of Non-Resistance, which was written by me, to draw out an investigation of the subject, or doctrine of Non-Resistance. I am a patron of the *Vergennes Vermont*, and think that it would do no more injury to that paper to print what might be said by me, in the investigation of this doctrine, (although weak and unskilled,) than it would to extol and laud some Revs., or approbate the doings of a riotous meeting. I therefore had the presumption to write the enclosed, and presented it on the 25th, inst. Dec., to Mr. Blaisdell, Editor of the *Vermont*, and requested him to print it. He at first remarked that it would not do, for it was too silly and foolish a doctrine; and that it had nothing to it, worth noticing, and that his patrons would not like it. I remarked that if he should leave out some anecdotes that did the world no good, and print something on the great reforms of the day, I would be responsible for the damage that his paper should suffer. He said it would draw out an opponent immediately. I told him that that was what I wished. He then said he did not wish to print any thing that would injure his business, for he printed a political paper. But I urged him to take it. He reluctantly said he would take it, and peruse it, and if he thought proper, would print it. He has perused and returned it, with a few lines and his signature. I since called on Mr. Blaisdell and asked him his objections to the article. He said it was well enough for the side that it took, but that it would not do for him to print it. I asked him if it was not courteous and candid. Oh, yes, said he, but my patrons would not put up with it. I wrote this, not knowing that you were about having from brother H. C. Wright the merited rebuke and exposure of the *Vergennes* riot, and its leader, (for I was present at the meeting, and I believe he wrote the truth.) But since this article could not be admitted into the columns of the *Vergennes* Vermont, I send the same to you, not urging an admission of so feeble a piece, into your valuable paper, but leaving it to your discretion. I cannot say that you have any thing in your well conducted paper that should give place for this production of mine. I know that silence becomes a humble citizen as I am. But, Brother, I am accused of being one of that dangerous, inconsistent, and silly sect, by some of my friends, and I thought that if I were to be condemned before I was heard, I would before execution try to be heard. I would say, let such be cautious, that, when they condemn the principle, they despise not the Founder of the principle; for I believe that Non-Resistance is not of modern origin, but that it is as ancient as the Sermons of Christ on the Mount.

Brother Murray:—If you should print the within article, make, of course, what comments you please; but if you think I have written any thing that might injure Mr. Blaisdell's feelings, or interest, pass it by, for I wish Mr. Blaisdell's greatest good. Yours, with great esteem, O. S. Murray.

Dear Sir,—I have perused the following article and come to the conclusion that it will not be proper for me to publish it, as it will most likely lead to a long controversy, on the subject, which I should very much regret. I think you had better send it to the *Telegraph* in Brandon, the editor of which, I have no doubt, would be happy to publish it. Yours with respect, E. W. BLAISDELL.

[Since the foregoing was in type, the last *Vergennes* Vermont has come to hand, containing an anonymous article thus prefaced: "Mr. Editor,—As you have kindly proffered your columns for articles on the subject of Non-Resistance, I have taken the liberty of sending you some remarks on that topic." &c. The same paper has another anonymous article on the subject, under the head, "Non-Resistance with a vengeance." From this, and from an anonymous article that appeared in the *Vermont* some weeks since, it appears that friend Blaisdell's paper is open to discussion on one side—or rather railing and vilification against Non-Resistants. If this be the thing, and this only, which his patrons call for, on the subject of Non-Resistance, they are to be pitied. And the Editor is not less to be pitied, if to gratify them thus is the course he feels bound to pursue.]

Mr. BLAISDELL:—Dear Sir,—Believing that you will allow me, though a humble citizen of this enlightened community, to speak a few words through your paper, I address you—having been lauded often of late, concerning the doctrine of Non-Resistance, by many of the citizens of *Vergennes*. I speak not on my own account—nor yet on account of Mr. H. C. Wright—but for the truth. Does it become us, as lovers of truth, or searchers after it, to judge of a cause or a doctrine, without examination? Perhaps some in this community have investigated the subject of Non-Resistance; but I believe most of them are ignorant of it, as I have been. Now it will be expected that in the examination of this great doctrine, we all may tread some ground that must be retraced. But let not this deter us from searching for light—nor the fact that this cause, like that which Paul advocated, is everywhere spoken against. No cause that promised any great good to fallen man, was ever preached without meeting op-

position—neither without its martyrs. I am not obligating myself to subscribe to all that Mr. Wright may have said—neither to animadvert upon the unbecoming treatment that he and all peace-abiding members of civil society received in your City Hall, the last evening he lectured there. But the question is, whether Jesus Christ taught Non-Resistance. To ascertain the truth on this point, I shall go to Christ and the Apostles. Christ says that, "until John, were the law and the prophets; but since that the kingdom of heaven is preached." Believing that we are now to be influenced and governed by a new dispensation, in which Christ is our lawgiver and the sealer of a new covenant, I believe also that it behooves us to acquaint ourselves with the laws of the kingdom, the requirements of the King, and the duties of the subjects. The prophets in speaking of this kingdom, called it "an everlasting kingdom."—Isaiah ii, 2:—"The Mountain of the Lord's House shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow into it." Rev. xi, 15: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." In the 24th chapter of Isaiah we are told what the subjects of this kingdom shall do:—"And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." By these passages, as we might by many others, we learn the extent, prevalence and durability of this Kingdom, as well as its nature, and the character of its subjects. But who will doubt that Jesus Christ is to be the King in this kingdom? This being admitted, we shall inquire of Isaiah something about the Ruler or King. Isaiah ix, 6, 7: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the Government shall be upon His shoulder. And His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." "Or the increase of his government and Peace there shall be no end," &c. By this we learn that the government rests not on the Hindoo or Hottentot, Arab or Turk, Savage or Barbarian, nor war-perpetrating Queen Victoria, or slaveholding or Seminole-hunting John Tyler, but on the Prince of Peace. This admitted, let us hear His law, which J. s. says i, 25: is a "perfect Law of Liberty,"—not of slavery but of love—not of death but of life—not of war but of peace and good will. Mat. v, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, "Ye have heard (referring to Moses) that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." &c. Math. v, 43, 44, and onward,—"Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven. For he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." &c. Mat. vi, 14, 15, "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." The natural heart is averse to this principle of love and forgiveness toward our enemies. Therefore we see the impropriety of pleading our instinct; for if our instinct were a right guide and law, there could be no use of any other. Or if the law of Moses were perfect, where would be the necessity of a new? Heb. viii, 7: "For if that first command had been faultless, then no place should have been sought for the second." Hence we find that the natural heart is opposed to the law of Christ; therefore in order that we may be obedient subjects to Christ, there must be a change in us. Strange as it is, this law of Christ has most of the world to oppose it. Opposers say that Non-Resistance would be desirable if all the world would adopt the principle.—This is virtually acknowledging that the principle is right; then if it is right, what excuse is it to us, if the world will not do right? Would it be right, if we lived in a community where a majority were thieves,

to say, I wish they were honest, but because they are not honest I must steal also? Opponents to this doctrine say that to avow this principle would be hazardous in this wicked world. I ask, do any suppose that Jesus Christ misjudged of the necessity or adaptedness of his doctrine to fallen man, to make them happy, or of the safety to his followers of obeying his commandments? Men are no more depraved now than they were when Christ taught this doctrine, or sent his disciples out to preach. He says Math. x, 16,—"Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves." And our Savior equipped not his followers with carnal weapons. No. But Paul describes the weapons: Eph. 6th chapter, he says their sword is "the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God." Christ does not tell his disciples, that man has framed or ever will frame a code of laws that they must obey, nor that they may confer with flesh and blood to know what is duty. Yet, tenaciously it is urged that a system of Government, of man's device, is necessary to be enforced with a penalty of death, at the discretion of fallible men. Where does Christ tell man to condemn and kill? No where. Paul did not think that this prerogative belonged to erring man. No! Heb. x, 30: "For we know Him that hath said, vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord." Often we are told "that somewhere Christ told his disciples to buy a sword." Truly: Luke xii, 36: "And he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one."—38: "And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords." And he said unto them, it is enough." Now let us inquire—enough for what? enough to resist the multitude? Absurd! But enough to teach a practical lesson. Our Savior knew well that the disciples had something of the same spirit and view of fighting our enemies, as many professing disciples at this day, notwithstanding all his sermons. So when the multitude came, Peter drew the sword, and smote off an ear of his enemy. But our Savior healed the ear; and, Math. xvi, 52, "then said Jesus unto him, put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Ever after this lesson, Peter practiced like his Master, non-resistance. John xiii, 36,—"Jesus answered, my kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." No. He that would follow Christ must not think to conform to the laws, usages and customs of this world. 1st John ii, 15,—"Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." John xvii, 14:—"I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of this world." 2d Tim. iii, 12: "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." Notwithstanding our Savior knew the enmity of the world, he did not tell his disciples to keep silent—not to preach, nor live non-resistance, until the world became a friend of grace, and his doctrine of non-resistance. No. Without human law, without the sword to protect them, he sends them forth to preach the kingdom of heaven—not the kingdom of men—and says, "fear not little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom," and that, "I have set up a kingdom, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." When the doctrine of Non-Resistance is presented, great anxiety is excited at once, concerning the wicked world; and much fear takes hold upon them about their safety of person and property. But this is not the fear our Savior enjoins upon us. He says, Math. x, 28, 30, 31: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." "But the very hairs of your head are all numbered." "Fear ye not, therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows." Great fear is manifested by the professed followers of the Prince of Peace, that the sword shall be taken away from them. But no excitement at the usual, common preaching of the doctrine of Christ. Non-Resistance has been quietly passed over. When practical Christianity is enjoined, to work as well as pray, then their slothfulness appears, with all their lack of faith. If by a

life of obedience to Christ ye are killed, count it gain. But what must be the attitude of that poor soul that kills one of its fellows? Christ told the Jews when they went about to kill him: John viii, 44: "Ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do, he was a murderer from the beginning." Disciples of Christ! why will you contend for a system of government that demands obedience with a penalty of death? And to justify such a law, appeal to the Mosaic dispensation? Does not Paul say, that they who read Moses, have the veil upon their hearts? What lacked Israel, when God led them by theocracy? Yet they desired to be as other nations round about them. So they demanded of Aaron a calf to worship, and a king to judge them, and go out before them, and to fight their battles. Men at this day are not content with the law of Christ. But they must have something to worship that they can accommodate to their carnal desires.

True, there were kingdoms of men on the earth, when Christ came to set up his kingdom, and to teach them how to live, and what to do. Does our Savior speak of human government, in a favorable light? Please read: Mat. x, 17, 18, 19, 20. We are told, that Paul exhorted the church, to pray for, and be subject to their rulers. What Paul would be understood to enjoin, it might be proper to inquire. Did Paul mean, that, if men commanded that which Christ had forbidden, they must be obeyed; or, if they had forbidden what Christ had commanded, that the apostles might disobey? Suppose a christian in Burmah, by the government is commanded to countenance and sustain the cruelties of Juggernaut, human sacrifice, or the burning the living on the funeral pile, must he obey? Put by the side of your decision on this, the duty of a hang-man when he is commanded by the law of Vermont to hang. Did not Paul, Peter and John do right, when the commands of men conflicted with those of Christ? When they were threatened, beaten and commanded not to teach any more in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, they answered, whether it be right to obey God rather than men, judge ye. Submit to your rulers, as Daniel did, when the unalterable decree went forth, that if any one should ask a petition of any God save of king Darius, for thirty days, he should be cast into the Lions' den. Or as the three young Hebrews did, when they were commanded by the idolatrous king to worship the image, when they said we are not careful to answer thee on this matter, no, although, the king threatened death in the fiery furnace. As far as Christ's law and human law coincide, human law can be no better than Christ's, all will admit. Well, who will contend, understandingly, that where they conflict and disagree, human law must be paramount? I hope no one. Let us contrast the law of Christ with the mild law of Vermont. Jesus Christ commands to love, bless, and forgive our enemies. Vermont law commands to imprison, condemn, and hang our enemies. Christ says, show mercy. The law says, mete out vengeance. Christ says, overcome evil with good. The law says, overcome evil with the sword. Christ came to give life. The law gives death. Christ says, fear not man. The law says, fear man. Has Jesus Christ set up a kingdom on the earth, and given only half laws enough to his subjects, and left the other half for depraved, ignorant and unstable man to enact the other, or else grope in darkness with only half a law? What kind of consistency is this? The same as that of the Pope of Rome, who supposes that he has power and license to decree, like a God. In this happy range and glance we arrive at the conclusion that Christ taught, lived and died, as a non-resistance. And he has commanded us to deny ourselves, take up our cross and follow him. Will we do it? The apostles did.

ONWARD.
Pilgrims' Highway, Dec. 25, '41.

The article below is from the pen of Edmund Quincy, one of the Editors of the *Non-Resistant*. Read it, and see how a man of 35, who has cultivated his moral perceptions, and cherished Christian fidelity, can teach a man of 70, who has given his life to things of human policy—and the latter no less a man than John Quincy Adams. O, how do patriotism and policy sink into nothingness before philanthropy and Christianity!

From the *Non-Resistant*.
THE MORALS OF POLITICS.
An extraordinary example of the ten-

dency of a life devoted to the pursuit, or the exercise, of political power, to deaden the moral perceptions, has been recently exhibited by John Quincy Adams, in a lecture on the present Chinese war. He defends the course of the British—not on the abstract right of that Christian power to poison its pagan antipodes at its pleasure, and for its profit, (which he denies to be the actual cause of the war;) but on the natural right of commerce, which right, it seems, according to this high authority, may be justly enforced at the point of the bayonet. This puts the whole affair on an entirely new footing, and alters the attitude of the invading nation from that of a ruffian insisting on cramming down the throats of a weaker people a poisonous drug, into that of a magnanimous champion of the human race doing battle for the insulted rights of man. This argument, to be sure, would come with a better grace from a South-Carolina nullifier, than from an advocate of the protective system. But statesmanship was invented for the reconciliation of incongruities. It is not improbable, that some of the advocates of free trade may seize upon some of Mr. Adams' propositions, and induce inferences from them which he would be sorry to see reduced to practice. He is obliged to admit that nations have a right to regulate their commerce, and to interdict the importation of certain articles, or else the American tariff is a violation of the law of nations; but when the interdictions amount to a prohibition of traffic, then the right accrues of compelling the refractory nation by force of arms to be obliging. Even on Mr. Adams' own grounds, the present aggression of Britain upon China is unjust, for China did not prohibit trade entirely, but merely regulated it as she deemed most for her advantage; and only broke it off with Britain in consequence of the introduction of a prohibited article,—which of course Mr. A. would not deny she had a right to do. But the nice point which will grow out of this new exposition of the laws of nations, is, how to decide what degree of interdiction amounts to a righteous cause of war, and who is to be the judge of it. Mr. Adams may congratulate himself on the introduction of that important branch of American jurisprudence, called Lynch Law, into the courts of nations. For the strongest is necessarily, as in this case, not only the judge, but also the executioner. Perhaps, after Great Britain has vindicated the rights of nations against the encroachments of China, she may turn her philanthropic arms against this country, and demand the free introduction of her manufactures at our ports. And I do not see what fault Mr. A. could find with such a movement, provided she should decide that our prohibitions are too heavy.

Another interesting and important point which is established in the laws of nations by this lecture is, that ill manners and foolish vanity are a sufficient cause of war. It seems that the Cross of England waves worthily over ships commissioned to teach a semi-barbarous people good manners by urging what Milton's devils would call "terms of weight, Of hard contents, and full of force urged home." The distinction between knocking the forehead nine times before the emperor, and kissing the hand of the king on the bended knee, is truly worthy of the big-endian and little-endian statesmen of Lilliput. But are we certain that this Chesterfieldian crusade will end with the conversion of the Chinese to the orthodox platform of good breeding? If the British tourists in this country are to be believed, our manners and customs are very far from the canonical standard. Perhaps the time may come when a British fleet will ride in our waters, and bombard our cities, for the purpose of compelling us to desist from our heresy of eating with our knives, and to comply with the demand of civilized Christendom, that we should eat our eggs from the shell. Mr. Adams thus opens a new and wide field for the extended usefulness of that instrument of civilization—war. It is only remarkable that he does not recognize the propagation of Christianity by the sword as a proper use of that beneficent implement. The English fleet, and the troops it bears, are a true specimen of the Christianity of modern Christendom, and Sir Henry Pottinger and Sir William Parker are better representatives of modern Christians than any missionaries, made to order, could possibly be—unless, indeed, it were the holy chaplains upon whom the Anglican bishops have laid their apostolic hands, and recognized as true sons of the Church. It were surely worth the while of a benevolent nation to incur the inconveniences—which, however, are daily prayed for with due libations, by the officers—of "a bloody war and a sickly season," for the sake of conferring upon the benighted Chinese the blessings of such a Christianity as that in which England and America now rejoice! It is good, at least, that the great doctrine of the natural right of trade should be reiterated and reiterated; and monstrous as are Mr. Adams' conclusions from this doctrine, it is not in vain that he has repeated it. May it go forth gathering strength in its progress, until it shall sweep away all those artificial barriers which men have devised to separate themselves from their brethren! It is indeed a natural right which every man receives from his Creator, to go whithersoever he will upon the highway of nations, and visit, without let or hindrance, for any righteous purpose, any of the dwelling-places of God's children. And every vic-